



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

07/236,724 08/26/88 MEZEI

M 1836,024844

BANNER, BIRCH, MCKIE & BECKETT
ONE THOMAS CIRCLE N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

PRATER, P

158

9

11/02/89

☒ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), _____ days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152. |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-15 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.

3. ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.

4. ☒ Claims 1-15 are rejected.

5. ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.

6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. ☐ This application has been filed with Informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable. ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948).

10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____ has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner. ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____, has been ☐ approved. ☐ disapproved (see explanation).

12. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received
☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____

13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit 158

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless-

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Janoff et al.

The examiner has cited a new ground of rejection, 102(e), so the rejection made in this action is not final.

Janoff et al discloses the method of providing local anesthesia by the use of lipid encapsulated anesthetics.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the

subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Janoff et al in view of Haynes.

Claims 1-15 are rejected for the reasons made of record in the previous action. Claims 1-2, 5-15 may be made allowable if the applicant will agree to the cancellation of claims 3 and 4 and the insertion of the limitations of these claims in claim 1. Claim 1 should also contain the limitation of claim 12.

It is the examiner's understanding that the applicant is willing to accept limitations in claim 1 regarding dosage and concentration as recited in claims 4 and 12 but not the Markush of claim 3. On page 8, line 16 of his specification the applicant discloses that "any anesthetic and analgesic agent" is suitable for use in his invention. Presumably the applicant has tried only a limited number of such agents in the concentration and dosage ranges specified, however. The applicant is limited to the agents for which he can show support in his specification. He is entitled to submit affidavits under 37 CFR 1.132 if the specification supports them.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Prater at telephone number 703-557-6525.

PJP
P. Prater:jaw

10/24/89

Ellis P. Robinson
ELLIS P. ROBINSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
ART UNIT 158